

2

NO ROMANIZING GERMS

IN

OUR PRAYER-BOOK.

BY A PRESBYTER

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

PHILADELPHIA:

CLAXTON, REMSEN, AND HAFFELFINGER,

819 AND 821 MARKET STREET.

1868.

NO ROMANIZING GERMS

IN

OUR PRAYER-BOOK.

BY A PRESBYTER

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

PHILADELPHIA:
CLAXTON, REMSEN, AND HAFELFINGER,
819 AND 821 MARKET STREET.
1868.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

NO ROMANIZING GERMS IN OUR PRAYER-BOOK.

A PAMPHLET has recently appeared which takes the ground that there are "Romanizing germs" in the Prayer-Book. Romanizing germs are thus described: They are

"Certain seminal doctrines which, being planted and taking root, in due time spring up and bear Romanism as their fruit. It may be modified by the soil which nourishes it, and by the circumstances of its growth. It is Romanism still, and is the natural development of the germ."

Three principal germs or seeds of Romanism in the Prayer-Book are indicated by the author. They are as follows:—

1. The Bible is not the sole rule of faith.
2. The ministry is an exclusive priesthood with supernatural powers.
3. The sacraments when administered by this priesthood are of singular efficacy.

The author assumes, as "an historic fact," that these seeds are in the Prayer-Book, and that "when developed they have uniformly germinated in Romanism." He admits that the great body of the Prayer-Book consists of pure Protestant and Bible truth. But he contends that the germs of Romanism are also there; and that when planted in a congenial soil, they spring up and choke the seeds of truth. The Prayer-Book consists of seed-wheat which, if it were thoroughly sifted, would bring forth a harvest from which could be produced the finest of the flour; but in it are mingled tares, and the tares are so prolific that when planted in certain soils they stifle the wheat, and now threaten to overrun and blight it all. In consequence of this increasing germination and development of the seeds of evil in the Prayer-Book, *it* has become an instrument of error and a source of false doctrine. It has proved to be a dangerous book.

"In view of these facts," the author writes, "we are forced to regard the Prayer-Book *as the fountain* whence flows that stream of Romanizing influence which is rapidly growing into a mighty river, and with its many branches penetrating our whole church."

And again:—

"They regard with alarm the influence of the Prayer-Book upon many of the souls committed to their charge."

We propose to examine these positions somewhat in the order in which they are presented in the pamphlet in which they appear.

I.

SHOULD ROMANIZING GERMS BE EXPECTED IN THE PRAYER-BOOK?

The author thinks they should. His reason is that whereas the Continental Reformation was spiritual in its origin, the English Reformation was political. But in so far as it was political, it was only, in the language of the author, "to secure freedom from the Italian Pope's supremacy." One might admit this statement as to the origin of the Continental and English Reformations respectively, and yet deny that this fact actually determined the character of the Reformation itself. The question is not: "How did the Reformation originate?" but "What was it when accomplished?" The Reformation in England, in consequence of the personal influence and opinions of Henry, was somewhat slower and more hindered in its progress than the Continental Reformation; yet when Cranmer and Ridley and their associates *prepared the Prayer-Book* they were at one with the Continental Reformers in all the great fundamental doctrines of the Protestant faith. We see not then how it can properly be said that we are to expect Romanizing germs in the Prayer-Book, because the English Reformation was less spiritual in its origin than the Continental. When their symbols and liturgies were constructed, they were equally spiritual in all the fundamental doctrines pertaining to justification and the divine life; and far more spiritual (if we understand the sense of the expression as used by the author) than the Continental Reformers in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Our author *thinks* he finds in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper in the Prayer-Book a fourth Romanizing germ; but we are sure that he will find, in the Lutheran formularies, that doctrine of consubstantiation which is more than

a mere Romanizing germ—which is in fact Romanism in the bud ; and even in the formularies of the Calvinistic Churches a doctrine of the Lord's Supper no more spiritual than that held by our Reformers, and embodied, as we believe, in our Articles and liturgy. It is not then a good reason for expecting to find Romanizing germs in the Prayer-Book, that the English Reformation was less spiritual *in its origin* than the Continental.

And indeed if there is anything which, in view of the usual workings of human nature, we should *not* expect to find in the Prayer-Book, it is precisely Romanizing germs. When able and learned, and profoundly earnest men, like the Reformers, come forth from a system of doctrine, they are very sharp-sighted to discern its seminal principles. And surely the writings of Cranmer, and Ridley, and Jewel abundantly demonstrate that they thoroughly understood Romanism—in root and branch, in seed and flower, and fruit, inside and outside, in its theories and in its practices, in its professed, and in its actual workings. No subsequent writings have exhibited such a thorough and exhaustive knowledge of Romanism—such a grubbing and sifting of the soil, in order to eradicate the last fibres, and the minutest seeds of that pernicious and poisonous plant. It is therefore wholly against what might have been expected, and no less against what is historically true, and can be demonstrated by a resort to their writings to state that “creeping flames enwreathed their martyr-brows, and became their chariot of translation before the old leaven of error was altogether purged away.”

Indeed, the well-known laws of human nature would rather lead us to anticipate that, instead of retaining any seminal principles of the old system, they would have been tempted, under the operation of the law of reaction, to reject some of the truths of God as Romish, because imbedded in the midst of Romish error. We can trace the influence of this law of reaction and revulsion in Luther, when he pushed the glorious doctrine of justification by faith alone, to the very verge of Antinomianism ; and in Cranmer when, in his abhorrence of the doctrine of the Pope's temporal and spiritual supremacy, he was driven to the extreme of claiming original spiritual authority for the crown. It has always hitherto been counted by members of our church one of the chief claims to honor on the part of the Reformers—an evidence of their signal wisdom and of the singularly harmonious development of their Christian character—that they were able so discriminatingly and calmly to separate the

precious from the vile, and not to throw away that which was from God, because it had so long been linked to that which came from man's carnal heart, or from the Evil One. The charge that our Reformers were in bondage to some remains of Romish error has constantly been made by the Puritans and their descendants until now; but it has been earnestly denied by the almost unanimous voice of our theologians, and by none more strenuously than by the Evangelical portion of the church.

II.

DID THE REFORMERS FINISH THEIR WORK ?

The statement which follows, that if the Reformers had lived three years longer, a third book would, in all probability, have been issued, is utterly without foundation. It is indeed against the concurrent testimony of the Reformers themselves, that the statement is made that

"When death knocked at the door of the studio where those diligent sculptors were at work, they dropped their chisels, and took a last fond look at their nobly-conceived but half-formed statue, and making speed to obey the summons which was of God, left that statue to be finished by other hands."

On the contrary, they felt that their work was done, and rejoiced with mutual congratulations upon its happy and final completion. The only authority for this assertion given by the author, is the general statement of a Puritan controversialist, more than a century after, and the Royal proclamation, *previous to the formation of the first book*, in which the Reformers were admonished to follow authority, and not rashly to innovate. But that the Reformers themselves were animated and urged by the king to free the Prayer-Book from every vestige of Romish error, and that they were confident that they had accomplished this work in the Prayer-Book of 1552, is abundantly evident.

In his controversy with Gardiner, when the latter appealed to the Prayer-Book in confirmation of his views of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the archbishop thus answered him:—

"That the book of Common Prayer neither used any such speech, nor taught any such doctrine; and that he (the Archbishop) did not in any point improve that Godly book, nor vary from it; and *that no man could mislike it that had any Godliness in him, joined with knowledge.*" (Strype, Ann. vol. 1, part 1, p. 127.)

That Ridley was equally satisfied with his work, that he regarded it as complete, appears from his language in reference to the malcontents with the Prayer-Book, who were stirring up strife on account of its use at Frankfort. Grindal was sent from the English Church in Strasbourg to that of Frankfort, to induce them to unite in the use of the second book of Edward. To him Ridley, just before his martyrdom, thus wrote:—

“Alas that our brother Knox” (who was the chief raiser of discontents against the use of it in the congregation of the English exiles there settled) “could not bear with our book of Common Prayer; matters against which, although I grant, a man (as he is) of wit and learning may find to make *apparent* reasons; but, I suppose, that he cannot be able soundly to disprove by God’s Word the reason he maketh against the Litany.” (Strype’s Grindal, p. 28.)

III.

WAS THE PRAYER-BOOK ROMANIZED ON THE ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH, IN ORDER TO CONCILIATE THE POPE AND PAPISTS?

It is seldom that a more sweeping and slanderous accusation against our church has been made, by its bitterest enemy, than is contained in the following words of one who professes to be its grieved and loving child:—

“The Liturgy was published early in Elizabeth’s reign, when there was hope of compromise with Rome, and hence is *Romish*. The Articles of 1562 were not formally published until 1571, at which time a coolness had sprung up between Elizabeth and the Pope, and hope of compromise was gone, and hence are *Protestant*. So that we are compelled to conclude that the Reformation, as taken up and forwarded under Elizabeth’s auspices, could not have been radically Protestant, nor the Liturgy, its written expression, altogether free from Romish taint.”

A similar charge, but more moderate in its language, was made by the Puritans at the Savoy conference. In their “exceptions against some passages in the present Liturgy,” they express themselves thus:—

“Further, we humbly desire that it may be seriously considered, that as our first Reformers, *out of their great wisdom*, did at that time so compose the Liturgy as to win upon the Papists, and to draw them into their church communion, by varying as little as well they could *from the Romish forms* before in use; so whether, in the present constitution and state of things among us, we should not, according to the same rule of prudence and charity, have our Liturgy so composed as to gain upon the judgment and affections of all those who in the substantial of the Protestant religion are

of the same persuasion as ourselves. Inasmuch as a more firm union and consent of all such, *as well in worship* as in doctrine, would greatly strengthen the Protestant interest against all those dangers and temptations which our intestine divisions and animosities do expose us unto from the common adversary."

Here the Puritans state that it was "great wisdom" on the part of the Reformers to "vary as little as well they could" from the "Romish forms before in use." There is no charge of the adoption of Romish dogmas or superstitions. On the same principle of wise adaptation, they would now have the Church rulers in like manner to vary as little as possible, as well *in worship* as in doctrine, from all those who "in the substantial of the Protestant religion" are at one with themselves. They make no such gross charge as that of our author, that "the Liturgy is Romish." They admit identity of doctrine. They only urge that as in their forms of worship they have changed as little as was consistent with Protestant and Gospel truth, for the purpose of winning Papists to their fold; so now, for the purpose of winning dissenters to the Church, they should differ as little as well they could from *them* "in worship and in doctrine." And it is evident that the Bishops and Divines of the Savoy commission so understood the Puritan objectors. They did not conceive that the Reformers were charged with having accommodated the *doctrines* of the Church to those of Rome. They reply, that as they have had respect to the feelings and habits of the Romanists, so far as fidelity to the truth would permit; so, in like manner, they have conformed to their Protestant brethren. They say that the Liturgy never was found fault with by those to whom the name of Protestant most properly belongs—those who profess the Augustinian confession. But they contend that it is unreasonable to call upon them to conform it to the prejudices of those "who have unreasonably and sinfully brought it into dislike."

Thus it is seen how much more serious is the charge brought against the Reformers by a modern churchman, than by the Puritans, in all the heat and passion of their first polemical zeal. But now let us examine more particularly this often reiterated but groundless charge, that the Liturgy was Romanized at the accession of Elizabeth, in order to conciliate the Pope and the Papists. Our author seems in the following words to intimate that a wholly transformed Liturgy was prepared:—

"The Liturgy was published early in Elizabeth's reign, when there was hope of compromise with Rome, and hence is Romish."

In opposition to this statement, it will be seen that it was avowedly the *second* or thoroughly Protestant, and not the *first*, Liturgy of Edward that was adopted on the accession of Elizabeth, against her wishes; that the changes in it were few and insignificant; that instead of there having been more, there was in fact less, deference to the feelings of the Romanists than during the reign of Edward; that the reasons why Romanists continued for some years to attend the parish churches were precisely such as induced them to do so during the reign of Edward; and that they ceased to do so because of orders from Rome, when it had become evident that Elizabeth could neither be won nor intimidated by the Pope.

(1.) It was avowedly the second Liturgy of Edward that was adopted on the accession of Elizabeth. She preferred and endeavored to secure the adoption of the first book of Edward. Cardwell (*History of Conferences*, p. 21) states that Guest, afterwards Bishop of Rochester, was added to the committee for the revision of the Prayer-Book, by Secretary Cecil, under the direction of the Queen; and that he had received instructions from Cecil in favor of the first service book of Edward. But it appears that Guest did not comply with this direction; for, in his report to Cecil, he argues against the re-introduction of ceremonies sanctioned by the first book of Edward:—

“Ceremonies once taken away as ill-used should not be taken again, though they be not evil of themselves, and might be well used.” (Strype’s *Annals*, vol. 1, part 2, appendix xiv.)

He also contends specifically against several of the usages retained in the first book. Hence it appears that Elizabeth was anxious for the adoption of the first book of Edward; that distrusting the willingness of the committee, as first appointed, to assent, she had added a favorite divine, who she supposed would urge the adoption of the first book with success; that even this divine strongly opposed the proposition to introduce the first book; and that it was avowedly the second book of Edward which was adopted, with a few unimportant alterations.

(2.) The changes introduced were as follows: Certain changes in the lessons were made. The petition in the Litany to be delivered from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome was omitted. They *were* delivered from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome; and it was not considered necessary or seemly any longer to pray for that deliverance. The prayer for the Queen was slightly altered. Both of the clauses at the presentation of the elements

which had stood, the one in the first and the other in the second, book of Edward, were put together. The rubric about ornaments in the first book of Edward was again introduced. The rubric was omitted which declared that no adoration was done or intended by kneeling at the sacrament. This rubric was re-introduced, however, in the revision of 1662; and Bishops Grindal and Horne, writing to Bullinger and Gaultier in 1567, assure them that this declaration of the omitted rubric "continued to be most diligently declared, published, and impressed upon the people." (Zurich Letters, p. 277.) These are absolutely all the changes introduced, and these, in the opinion of the author under review, were sufficient to transform the thoroughly Protestant Liturgy of Edward into a Romish formulary! The statement is too extravagant to need comment.

(3.) The truth is that instead of any attempt to conciliate the Romanists on the part of those who *controlled* the Protestant movement and fixed the formularies of the Church, there was, in fact, less deference to their feelings and opinions than in the reign of Edward. No doubt the Queen desired and used her utmost influence to secure a more stately and elaborate ritual, and one more nearly conformed to that of the Church of Rome. Her position is accurately stated by Miss Aiken (Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth, p. 251):—

"Probably had she found herself free to follow the dictates of her own inclination she would have established in the Church of which she found herself the head a kind of middle scheme devised by her father."*

But the Queen could not carry out her views. She could not find any divines of standing to comply with her wishes. She was compelled to choose between a thorough and pronounced Protestant formulary and submission to the Pope.

The revisors of the Liturgy were in fact *less* scrupulous in their censures of Romish errors than the original composers of them in the reign of Edward.

"For now" (in the language of Archbishop Laurence) "the sacrifices of the mass which were denominated by their predecessors simply *figmenta*, they characterized as *blasphema figmenta*, not hesitating to call that which was universally esteemed the most sacred, and which certainly was the most lucrative doctrine of the Romish Church, blasphemous." (Bulley's Variations of the Communion and Baptismal Offices, p. xiv.)

* In confirmation of this statement, see Strype's Annals, vol. i., part i., p. 2; Idem, i. p. 237; Idem, i. pp. 259-62; Life of Parker, i. pp. 90-92, 191-193.

To the same purport is the fact that the prohibition against controversies was then omitted:—

“It being thought very fitting,” says Strype, “that the errors of the Popish religion should be treated of and confuted for the vindication of the Reformation.” (Strype’s Parker, i. 316.)

Even that restoration of the rubric of “the ornaments,” which was subsequently never enforced, and, as we believe, was fully nullified by the authority of the Queen herself, was not, at the time of its restoration, regarded by those who restored it as of binding obligation. Bishop Sandys (Cardwell’s Conferences, 36) writes:—

“The last book of the service is gone through, with a proviso to retain ornaments that were in use in the first and second year of King Edward VI., until it please the Queen to take other order for them. Our gloss upon this text is that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others, in the meantime, shall not convey them away; but *that they may remain for the Queen.*”

(4.) Much use has been made of the fact that the Romanists continued to attend the parish churches during the first ten or twelve years of Queen Elizabeth’s reign. This has been regarded as a proof that the Liturgy was so Romanized that they could attend the services without a violation of their conscience. But the truth is that they did the same thing during the whole reign of Edward. The same cause which induced them to attend the services of the Church under Edward *continued* to operate under Elizabeth. It was from no change in the Liturgy that this policy was pursued. The Popes allowed and encouraged Romanists to attend the parish churches, so long as there was any hope that England could be recovered to the Papal obedience. On the accession of Queen Elizabeth, that hope in the Papal Court was fostered by the reports of its emissaries as to the personal tastes and feelings of the Queen. It was known that she persisted against the remonstrances of her most favored divines to have the crucifix and lights in her own chapel; that she objected to the removal of images; that she was bitterly opposed to the marriage of the clergy; that she avowed her belief in the doctrine of a real presence in the Eucharist, and admitted that she sometimes worshipped the Virgin Mary. But when, notwithstanding all this, it became evident that the Queen would never again subject herself to the Papacy, and when the Pope launched against her his excommunication, and absolutely forbade the Romanists to attend the services of the Church, *then*, and not until then, did they cease to frequent the parish churches. The reason that

they had not come before was not that the services of the Church of England were Romanized; nor did they leave because they were subsequently Protestantized. What they were during the reign of Edward, that they continued to be during the earlier and the later period of the reign of Elizabeth.

So far, indeed, from any Romanizing of the Liturgy on the accession of Elizabeth, the historical fact is beyond all question, that, but for the personal influence and will of the Queen, the Church would have then lost many things which all classes of churchmen have since regarded as important. The desire to carry the Reformation further forward, which the author erroneously attributes to the Reformers in the days of Edward, *was* undoubtedly experienced by those who fixed the services in the reign of Elizabeth. But the changes which they desired were *in the matter of ceremonies and vestments*. There was no suggestion of change in the Liturgy; no discovery in it of Romanizing germs; no wish expressed for alteration, or even for alternate forms, on the ground of possible, or probable, or actual misapprehension. On the contrary, the Reformers then preferred reluctantly to accept the ceremonies rather than resign all their offices, because, though they regarded some of the ceremonies as tending to superstition, they considered that the Liturgy set forth pure Scriptural and Protestant truth; and permitted them, and indeed enjoined them, to preach nothing but the truth as it is in Jesus. Bishop Pilkington, in a letter to Gaultier, says:—

“I confess we suffer many things against our hearts, groaning under them. We cannot take them away, though we are ever so much set on it. We are under authority, and cannot innovate anything without the Queen.” (Burnet, *Reformation*, p. 828.)

Bishop Jewel expressed himself, as did several others of the leading Reformers, still more strongly on the subject of vestments. Jewel wrote to one of the foreign Divines (Simler):—

“That he found debates raised concerning the vestments, which he calls the habit of the stage, and wishes they could be freed from it.” He says, “they were not wanting to so good a cause; but others seemed to love these things, and to follow the ignorance of some priests who were stupid as logs of wood, having neither spirit nor learning nor good life to commend them. Some are so much set (he says) on the matter of habits, as if the Christian religion consisted in garments. But we (says he) are not called to consultations concerning that scenical apparel; he could set no value on those fopperies. Some were setting up a golden mediocrity; he was afraid it would prove a leaden one.” (Burnet, 820.)

Says Strype:—

“And first the Bishops who were but newly returned out of their exiles, as Cox, Grindal, Horne, Sandys, Jewel, Parkhurst, Bentham, upon their first returns before they entered upon their ministry, labored all they could against receiving into the church the Papistical habits, and that all the ceremonies should be clean laid aside. But they could not obtain it from the Queen and Parliament. And the habits were enacted. Then they consulted together what to do, being in some doubt whether to enter upon their functions. But they concluded unanimously not to desert their ministry for some rites; which they considered were but few and not evil in themselves, especially *since the doctrine of the Gospel remained pure and entire*; and in this counsel which they had taken, they continued still well satisfied.” (Strype’s Annals of Ref., i. 263–4.)

So strongly did the current of reaction against Romanism set in, at the very period when it is charged that the Prayer-Book was made Romish! On the contrary, a memorable attempt to *diminish* the ceremonial of the church was made in the Convocation of 1562, and failed in the lower house by a majority of only *one*! If it had been carried there, it is highly probable that it would have been sanctioned in the upper house—it being doubtful whether there was more than one Bishop who did not prefer that the vestments should be abolished. Neal, indeed, declares that there was not one; but there is no proof that Parker wished them removed. The points upon which so large a vote was obtained were—that all holy days except Sundays and the principal feasts of Christ be abrogated; that the priest should always turn his face to the people in reading the Common Prayer; that the sign of the cross in Baptism should be omitted; that kneeling at the Sacrament should be discretionary; that no other garment but the surplice should be used, and that organs should be abolished.

Thus it is seen that the Queen could not get from the Divines anything more than the thoroughly Protestant second Prayer-Book of Edward; and that the Divines could not get from her anything less—vestments included.

IV.

HAS THE PRAYER-BOOK BEEN ROMANIZED SINCE THE DAYS OF ELIZABETH?

The author admits that the changes made in 1662 are considered by Dean Goode and others as trifling and unimportant.

He states, however, that others regard them as vital and fundamental. What were they? They were as follows, viz.: some slight changes in the mere arrangement of the services. The new version of the Bible was adopted, except in the Psalms, the ten commandments, and the sentences in the communion office. This was the most important change which they made. The prayer for Parliament, for all conditions of men, the general thanksgiving, and some new collects were added. The service for baptism of those of riper years was introduced, and also the form of prayer to be used at sea. A few other very minor changes were made. It is difficult to see which of these was vital and fundamental. There was indeed one change which may by some be so regarded. But it was a change, not in a Romanizing but in a Protestant direction. *The rubric explanatory of the meaning of kneeling at the sacrament was restored.*

The English Prayer-Book remains in the form in which it was then settled. Our American Prayer-Book has indeed been considerably modified; but it has been chiefly in the direction of the efforts by which the author states that "the Royal Commission of 1689 sought to bring back our venerated formulary nearer to the spirit of the second book of Edward of 1552." Some of the most important of the changes then suggested were adopted in our book.

These facts lead us to a directly opposite conclusion from that of the author, viz.: that we *can* "fairly assert that the Prayer-Book which we now use *is* the one left us by the Edwardian Reformers;" and that there are *not* good grounds, either in reason or in history, for expecting to find Romanizing germs in our Prayer-Book.

It is, moreover, a little remarkable to observe that while the Romanizing germs are in general referred to the changes made in the second book of Edward, most of those which are specified are found to be those which were in that book. Nor can we refrain from remarking that some of these charges are so trivial as to seem to betray an eager desire to make out a case against the Liturgy. Some of these specifications we shall dismiss with great brevity. Indeed, they are, for the most part, such a mere re-hash of the old and oft-refuted Puritan objections and cavils, that they scarcely need an elaborate confutation.

V.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE RULE OF FAITH.

It is admitted by our author that our Articles VI. and XX. lay down a rule of faith the very opposite of the Romish dogma. But "then pushing our investigations further, we find that the traditions of men (using the word traditions as comprehensive of what has been delivered) are united with the Holy Scriptures"—for what purpose? as a joint rule of faith? as of equal authority? No—simply "to *instruct us* in four important particulars"! Nothing could be less to the purpose than this remark; unless it be the quotation from the last clause of Article VI., to the effect that the "church does *not* apply the Apocrypha to establish any doctrine." The Articles announce that the Bible is the sole rule of faith. But then they add that the Apocrypha, the Homilies, and the ancient authors instruct us in four important particulars! If they had asserted that these documents and authors instruct us in forty important particulars, they would in no wise have weakened their assertion that the Bible is the sole rule of faith. With the utmost desire not to do so, we find it difficult not to ridicule this strange and inept style of argument.

The same kind of remark is applied to the Homilies. They are declared to contain a godly and wholesome doctrine. What then? They are not joined with Scripture as a rule of faith. Even the order to read them in our churches is suspended. They are expressly excluded from any such office as that of supplementing the word of God. They are simply godly and wholesome sermons.

We scarcely know how to deal with what follows in reference to the preface to the Ordinal. It is gravely argued, because that preface asserts that it is evident from "Holy Scripture and from *ancient authors*" that from the Apostles' time there have been three orders in the church, that our polity, "so far as any would make it to be of divine origin, rests for its authority on the traditions of men." We doubt whether any one ever before attributed this meaning to the language. It is too obvious to need explanation that the Holy Scriptures are referred to as witnesses that Episcopacy was established in the days of the Apostles; the ancient authors are referred to as witnesses that it was continued in the Church. If similar language were used in reference to the Constitution of the United States and its first expounders, no one

could mistake its meaning. If it were written: "It is evident from the Constitution, and from the fathers who expounded it, that from the first establishment of the Government there have been judges of the Supreme Court, heads of departments," &c., the meaning of the language would be readily understood. No one would say that the declaration implied that the Constitutional authority for the origin of these offices rested upon the testimony of the first expounders of the Constitution. Every one would see that the statement expressed the fact that judges, heads of departments, &c., were provided for by the Constitution; and that this conclusion was confirmed by the writings of the early commentators upon this document. But the fallacy is too gross to need further comment.

VI.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY.

Here it is contended that the Prayer-Book contains the germ of the second element of Romanism, namely, that the ministry is an exclusive priesthood with supernatural powers. This is urged from the name, the function, and the character attributed to the ministerial office. And—

First, of the name. The word priest is admitted to be a contraction of the word *presbyteros* or elder. Then it must in the Prayer-Book mean elder, and nothing more. "But no," says the author, "in Mediæval days, the word priest acquired a new meaning, that of a *sacerdos* or sacrificing priest, and not that of a teaching and preaching elder." Hence he would have the word disused, and the word *minister* introduced in its place. But the word minister is general, and could not be used as the synonyme of presbyter. The church often wishes to express the word and the office *presbyter*; and hence she sometimes uses the word *presbyter* in full, sometimes the word in its abbreviated form, *priest*. But the word priest, although confessedly identical with presbyter, should not be used, or at least cannot be used without becoming a Romanizing germ, because Rome has transformed its meaning. But Rome has transformed the meaning of the words *Church*, *Baptism*, *Eucharist*, *Catholic*, &c. Shall we therefore not use them? Are *they* also Romanizing germs? She has transformed the meaning of almost all Scriptural and theological

terms. Shall we therefore introduce a new vocabulary? The most fruitless as well as unwise, and we may add unbecoming thing on the part of a church which claims to be Apostolical and Evangelical, would be to attempt to modify her own Scriptural and theological terms, venerable from the use of ages, and to abandon her own well-chosen phraseology, because in other churches or other associations their meaning has been modified or corrupted. (See Hooker, bk. v. chpt. lviii. §§ 2, 3.)

(2.) The *functions* attributed to the priesthood are declared to be *sacerdotal* in their character. This is argued first from the fact that the declaration of absolution is to be made by the priest alone. But, as we have seen, the priest is synonymous with presbyter; and that which he pronounces is not an absolution by himself of the sinner, but only a declaration of God's forgiveness. In point of doctrine, the act and the actor are both diametrically opposite to what they profess to be in the church of Rome. In the latter, a priest professes to forgive sins. In the former, a presbyter declares that God forgives the sins of the penitent; and he cannot do even this without an urgent solicitation to the people to pray that they may have true faith and repentance. The only ground of objection, then, which can be urged against this office is that it is limited to the presbyter, and not extended to the deacon and the layman.

Now, if the author of the pamphlet believes, as we assume that he does, the declaration of the preface of the Ordinal, that from the Apostles' time there have been these three orders in the church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons—and that they are to be reverently retained, then we infer that he admits also that each order has its peculiar functions. The function of a Bishop is to confirm, ordain, and exercise jurisdiction within his Diocese. That of the presbyter is to preach, administer the sacraments, and exercise discipline within his parish. What appertaineth to the office of a deacon is declared in the Ordinal: It is to assist the priest in the holy communion, to read Scripture and homilies in the church, to teach the youth the Catechism, in the absence of the priest to baptize, to seek out and aid the poor and suffering, and to preach if he be licensed to do so by the Bishop. Here it is seen that the peculiar function of the diaconate is to assist the priest; and that he may not even baptize, except in the absence of the priest; and that he cannot preach, except he is specially licensed thereto by the Bishop. Hence it is seen that preaching is not reckoned as one of the powers conferred by ordination,

but is contingent on the permission of the Bishop. The Liturgy is constructed upon the theory that preaching and the administration of the sacraments and the exercise of discipline belong, not to deacons, but to priests. Hence this solemn act of the declaration of the forgiveness of sins, following the full confession of sins, is properly limited to the priest. If it is to be considered, as we believe it is, as the act of the presbyter, in the character of the ambassador of God, the preacher of the gospel of forgiveness to the penitent and believing, then it is peculiarly appropriate that it should be pronounced only by those (the bishop and the priest) to whom the office of preaching is, unless in exceptional cases, limited. And to us the office seems to present the ambassador of Christ—charged with the great function of proclaiming forgiveness to penitent and believing sinners, and of exercising discipline—in an attitude which exalts his ambassadorship. It is the highest possible testimony to the dignity of preaching—of the authorized proclamation of the Gospel. It is, as it were, the gathering up into one solemn official act of the blended functions of preaching and of discipline. While all the people are upon their knees, after a full confession of their sins, the priest proclaims in the name and by the authority of the Saviour, that God, in his infinite mercy, pardoneth and absolveth *all* those who “truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel.” Viewed in this, its true light, the declaration is intensely Protestant.

The same course of reasoning applies to, and explains, the reason why to priests alone, and not to deacons, are assigned the consecration of the elements, and the bestowal of the benediction. We do not understand the remark of the author, in this connection, as to the priestly function of conferring baptismal regeneration. Whatever is meant by that phrase, it is conferred by the deacon or by a layman, if lay baptism be admitted to be valid, as well as by the priest—for he is permitted to baptize. This fact of itself disproves the assertion that there is intended to be anything sacerdotal in the functions of the priest—or that the name implies any such character—for that which is asserted by the author to be eminently a sacerdotal act is performed alike by the deacon and the priest and the layman. It may also be remarked, in reference to the limitation of the benediction to the priest, that in all denominations of Christians this function is also, in like manner, confined to those who are ordained, and officiate as regularly called and appointed ministers. No deacon or class leader or layman ever presumes in the Presbyterian or

Methodist or other Churches to pronounce the benediction. Is this, their prerogative, an assumption of sacerdotal power? Is it a Romanizing germ?

The form by which the deacon is "made" is contrasted with that for the ordination of a priest; and the question is asked, seemingly in triumph—"Who can deny that the person thus ordained is called to exercise higher and different functions than belong to him who is made a deacon?" Who indeed? And does the author deny that he *ought* to be called to higher and different functions? If so, then he is not an Episcopalian. Nay, he is not a Presbyterian nor a Baptist. They believe that an elder is called to "higher and different functions than" those of the Deacon.

(3.) The *character* of the ministerial office is next considered. The author charges the Prayer-Book with the doctrine of an exclusive priesthood, transmitted by a tactual Apostolic succession. This, he claims, is proved by the form of consecrating a Bishop.

We do not know from what stand-point of doctrine with regard to the ministry our author writes. But his entire argument upon the subject of the ministry is such as might come from a Plymouth brother, who rejects all distinction between the clergy and laity, and of course *à fortiori* all distinction between different orders of the ministry. But we assume that he believes in an Apostolically constituted, threefold ministry, and objects only to the supposed exclusiveness of Episcopal ordination, and to the power which he believes is claimed in the Ordinal of *conveying* the Holy Ghost. On that assumption we proceed in the remarks which follow.

The author then will not deny that the authority of the ministry proceeds from the Holy Ghost (Acts xiii. 2; xx. 28).

Candidates for the three orders respectively solemnly declare that they believe they are called to their offices by the Holy Ghost—"inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost"—"called according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ." *Before* their ordination and consecration then they have, as they believe, and as those who ordain them believe, already received the inward call of the Holy Ghost. *That*, therefore, the ordaining Bishop cannot claim to convey. But even in the days of Christ and his Apostles there was an external, as well as an internal, call and designation to the ministry. Christ called the Apostles. The Apostles called and designated others. Both calls, or the one

call consisting of these two parts, are assigned in Scripture to the Holy Ghost.* After Christ and his Apostles had left the world, and miraculous external designation to the ministry ceased, the same divine, supernatural inward call by the Holy Ghost was to be renewed; and an outward designation, not miraculous, but by the same authority of the Holy Ghost, was also to be added to the inward call. All who profess to exercise an Ambassadorship for Christ claim that they have received both the inward call, and the valid outward designation, on the authority and in accordance with the mind of the Holy Spirit. Our Church claims that this external designation and authorization is confided to the third order of the ministry.

Be it observed then that the Ordinal makes no claim to the conveyance of the Holy Spirit, the inward call to the ministry. It recognizes that as already made. Its work, therefore, is to convey the outward call. It cannot mean that the Bishop conveys to the soul of the candidate the Holy Ghost, whose inward working and moving and abiding qualifies him spiritually for the ministry. The entire service precludes any such supposition. It is not guilty of the absurdity of professing to convey what it so earnestly seeks to be assured has been conveyed already. It can only claim to complete the work in accordance with the authority derived from the Holy Ghost, by the conveyance of the external commission.

This may be done in two methods. The first is by a formula which simply purports to convey the external commission. Such is one of the two forms provided by our American Church, in the service for the ordination of a priest, which is as follows:—

“Take thou authority to execute the office of a priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of his holy sacraments, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

There can be no misapprehension as to the meaning of these words. They are in their purport a divinely authorized conveyance of the *office* of the priesthood. But there is also another form of words in which this commission may be conveyed. It is the form in which the Saviour himself originally conveyed their

* “As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.” (Acts xiii. 2.)

“Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.” (Acts xx. 28.)

commission to the Apostles. This form was the one originally adopted and still retained by our mother church of England, and which now stands as the first of the two forms provided by our own Church. We have seen, however, that the Ordinal cannot, consistently with itself and from the nature of the case, claim for the Bishop authority to convey anything more than the external call. When, therefore, it adopts the language of the Saviour, uttered when he commissioned his Apostles, and says: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost for the *office* and *work* of a priest," etc., it is evident from the very expressions "*office*" and "*work*" that reference is made to external authorization, which is consigned by the Holy Ghost to the Bishops of the Church, in order that they may add the outward to the inward call, and thus make their commission complete. If it be said that the words *seem* on the face of them to be a claim of the conveyance of the inward and spiritual grace of the priesthood, it may be answered that the previous portions of the service show that such a claim cannot be made. And if it be asked, "Why then should words which are susceptible of such a meaning be adopted?" the answer is that there is a peculiar propriety, when exercising authority conferred or performing functions prescribed by the Saviour and the Holy Spirit, that the very words in which such authority was originally conveyed, or such functions originally prescribed, should be adopted. The Church has adopted this method in the administration of the Lord's supper, and of baptism and confirmation. Then all that is permanent and essential will be seen to be retained, and all that was temporary, and connected with the miraculous period, will be understood to have ceased. It is certain that such was the view of the framers of these services. Bishop Jewel, who was very influential in the settlement of the Church and her offices in the days of Elizabeth, emphatically declares that the ordination was but the conveyance of the *office*; and that the power of the keys, contained in the same formula of the ordination office, was not to be regarded as an *absolution*, but only as an authoritative declaration of forgiveness on the performance of its conditions.

It is beyond all question that our Church so understood this formula when she adopted and adapted to our country the Liturgy of the Church of England. This is clear from the fact that she introduced the alternate form to which we have already referred. "Take thou authority to execute the office of a priest," etc. This second form explains the first. It is our Church's explana-

tion of her understanding of the meaning of the first form. For it cannot, for a moment, be supposed that she has two methods of ordination to the priesthood, one of which simply conveys the external commission, and the other of which conveys the gift of the Holy Ghost. This fact is conclusive of her meaning. It explains as well the language of the Ordinal in the consecration of Bishops, to which the author refers with so much confidence and so much holy horror. There is nothing in it of "transmitted grace," of "tactual succession," and of "sacerdotal exclusiveness." It implies a general statement—which, who will deny?—that the Holy Ghost has provided that there shall be an external authorization for the ministry of those whom He has inwardly moved and called; and it implies—and what churchman will not admit it?—that the persons to whom this authorization is committed are the Bishops of the Church; but it makes no assertions regarding exclusiveness and tactual succession. If there are those who draw inferences of this sort, there are others who can, and do, draw inferences precisely opposite.

We conclude this branch of the subject in the words of the wise Hooker:—

“A thing much stumbled at in the manner of giving orders is our using those memorable words of our Lord and Saviour Christ, ‘Receive the Holy Ghost.’ The Holy Ghost they say we cannot give, and, therefore, we ‘foolishly’ bid men receive it. Wise men, for their authority’s sake, must have leave to befool them whom they are able to make wise by better instruction. Notwithstanding, if it may please their wisdom as well to hear what fools can say, as to control that which they do, thus we have heard some wise men teach, namely, that the ‘Holy Ghost’ may be used to signify, not the Person alone, but the gifts of the Holy Ghost; and we know that spiritual gifts are not only abilities to do things miraculous, as to speak with tongues which are never taught us, to cure diseases without art, and such like, but also that the very authority and power which is given men in the Church to be ministers of holy things, this is contained within the number of those gifts whereof the Holy Ghost is author, and therefore he which giveth this power may say, without absurdity or folly, ‘Receive the Holy Ghost,’ such power as the Spirit of Christ hath endued his Church withal, such power as neither prince nor potentate, king nor Cæsar on earth can give. So that if men alone had devised this form of speech thereby to express the heavenly wellspring of that power which ecclesiastical ordinations do bestow, it is not so foolish but that wise men might bear with it.” (Hooker, bk. v. ch. lxvii. § 5.)

VI.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS: BAPTISM.

From the specimens given above it will be seen by what methods and in what spirit Romanizing germs are sought, and thought to be found in the Prayer-Book.

Having shown that the general historical assumptions upon which the author proceeds are unfounded, and that the alleged sacerdotal character of the Ordinal is not sustained, we shall treat the remaining specifications with more brevity.

Under the head of baptism, the author of course repeats the charge that the Prayer-Book teaches baptismal regeneration, or "salvation by baptism."

The first objection which is made, is to the importance attached to the fulfilment of the command and institution of the Saviour. One should be very careful—and especially should a church, in her offices, be careful—not to depreciate the importance of a sacrament instituted by Christ himself. The assertion of the author that baptism is regarded as of *vital* importance in the Prayer-Book, is nullified by *his* own admission, that our book expresses no judgment about unbaptized infants.

Upon the chief remaining argument we make two observations:—

(1.) It is a little remarkable that if this be a Romanizing germ, it was not found in the still partially Romanized First Book of Edward, but was introduced into the thoroughly Protestant second book—the book concerning whose alleged subsequent Romanizing manipulation there are several expressions of regret and lamentation! And what is still more remarkable is, that this obnoxious form seems to have been modelled upon a prayer set forth by Luther, and upon the "consultation" of Herman, which was composed by Bucer and Calvin.

(From Bailey's *Rituale Anglo-Catholicum*, p. 267): Then shall the Godparents hold the little Child in Baptism, and let the Priest say, while he draws on the prescribed vestment: May the God Almighty and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has given thee a new birth through the Water and the Holy Ghost, and has forgiven thee all thy sins, strengthen thee with his Grace unto Life eternal, Amen.—*Luther's Manual of Baptism*, ed. 2d (X. 2637).

Let the Godfathers forthwith receive the infant from Baptisme, the priest sayinge, as it foloweth; The almyghtie euerlastynge God, and father of

oure Lorde Jesus Christ, who hath begotten the agayne wyth water, and the holye goste, and hath forgyuen the all thy synnes, confirme the with hys grace, unto euerlastynge lyfe. Amen. Here lette the whole congregation synge in Donehe. Nowe all thanks &c. or the Psalme God be mereiful unto us.—*Herman's Consultation*, fol. 167.

(2.) And as a complete answer to the entire argumentation of several pages, we observe that instead of an objection being made to the declaration that the infant baptized is regenerate, it should be made to that which precedes it in the service. It should be made to the fiction, or the hypothesis, that the child himself makes a profession of faith and repentance. It should be made, in short, to the sponsorial system. If it is assumed that the child repents and believes, then it *must* be assumed that he is regenerate. We do not enter, here, into a defence of the system of sponsors—for that is not attacked. But let the reader observe how impossible it is for the church to say less, so long as she assumes that the child professes faith and penitence, and obedience. The service says, in substance, to the adult candidate for baptism: "Dost thou repent and believe?" On the affirmative reply the declaration, in substance, is made: "Then (*i. e.* in case thou hast truly repented and believed) having also conformed to Christ's command to be baptized, thou art regenerate." It could say no less. In like manner, the service puts the question to the infant: "Dost thou repent and believe?" and on the (supposed) answer of the infant through his sponsors, he also is pronounced regenerate. In this case, as in the other, the Church could say no less. And that it is indeed the infant himself, and not the sponsors, except as *representing* the infant, who is addressed, appears from the fact that in the first Liturgy of Edward, it was the infant himself and not the sponsors to whom the question was directed. The rubric was in these words: "Then shall the priest demand *of the child* these questions following; first naming the child and saying: Dost *thou*," &c. The child does not promise that in the future he will repent and believe. He professes to do so at the time of his baptism. He makes the promise after the assurance that God on his part will most surely perform his promises to bestow pardon and a new nature upon him, if he on his part shall exercise the graces specified. And the child answers: "I (now) renounce," &c.; "I *do* believe," &c. Then the minister pronounces that he is regenerate. In the case of private baptism, where the child is also declared regenerate, the same supposition of sponsorship is made, for it is provided that

the child shall subsequently be brought to the church, and that sponsors shall then answer for the child. Now here it will be seen that there is no attempt, as the author charges, to prove that the real meaning of the word *regenerate* "is hidden, and is the reverse of what its name indicates." On the contrary, the explanation of Evangelical men is the only one which leaves the word in all its spiritual purity as synonymous with the new birth—as equivalent to the Latin *renati* in the XXVIIth Article. Assuming a true repentance and faith, it assumes, as following a compliance with Christ's commands, a true regeneration. It is by those who hold the doctrine technically called *baptismal regeneration*, and not by those who *deny* the doctrine, or group of doctrines which go under that name, that the full spiritual signification of the word is changed and lowered. The author speaks as if those who contend for baptismal regeneration—a regeneration actually and always accomplished at the moment and in the act of baptism—claimed that the full spiritual transformation, the inner, new birth of the spirit, was of necessity signified and contended for by all those who adopt that phrase to express their views of the significance and efficacy of the sacrament. But in truth it is they who accept the various doctrines that go under that name who do *not* adhere to the true, one, scriptural, spiritual meaning of regeneration; and it is they who reject one and all of those interpretations, and who do not believe that spiritual regeneration is invariably tied to the ministration of baptism, who always attach to the word *regeneration* its full spiritual signification. It is some of the advocates of baptismal regeneration who attempt to prove that its real meaning "is the reverse of what its face indicates."

Three of the four principal theories of baptismal regeneration give to the term regenerate a signification different from its real and spiritual meaning. One of them, the theory of Bishop Mant, regards it as the implantation of a *germ* of a new nature. Another, that of Bishop Hobart, which was sanctioned by the unanimous vote of the House of Bishops, and by a large majority in the House of Clerical and Lay Delegates, in 1826, describes the regeneration in baptism as "a titular kind of regeneration, or investment promissory, actual possession to be secured on the terms of the Covenant." Another theory is that of the Romanists, which is adopted also by Dr. Pusey. It is connected with the Romish theory of the impartation to Adam of a supernatural gift of grace, and of the loss of that gift by the fall, through

which Adam was reduced to his original condition by nature. It is claimed that baptism superinduces upon this original nature the gift of grace lost by the fall. But this grace is represented as *dwelling in* the soul, as the Shekinah dwelt in the temple, not *entering into* it, as light enters into the diamond. It is only a fourth view, held by some members of our own church, which, passing beyond all others in its representation of the efficacy of baptism, retains the full spiritual meaning of the word regeneration, and connects it invariably and infallibly with the administration of baptism.

Thus it is seen that our service rightly interpreted—interpreted as the logical necessities of the case require—always makes spiritual regeneration connected with and dependent upon the exercise of faith and repentance; and that it is those only who make its efficacy and reality depend upon something else, who are driven to make explanations of the meaning of the word “which are the reverse of what its name indicates,” or are inconsistent with its true signification.

There is then no Romanizing germ in the phraseology of the Prayer-Book concerning regeneration. Our author refers us to the Continental Reformation as more spiritual than the English; and to its formularies as void of those Romanizing germs which are unhappily retained in our Liturgy. But, indeed, we shall find in these Churches, and in the English Presbyterian Church, modelled after them, where there is no system of sponsorship, that language is used, concerning the present spiritual blessings connected with the performance of the sacrament, very similar to that of our Prayer-Book, where the system of sponsorship prevails. Are they Romanizing germs?

The Confession of Faith of the Church of Scotland says expressly that:—

“By the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered but really exhibited and conferred *by the Holy Ghost to such (whether of age or infants)* as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God’s own will in his appointed time.”

The Westminster Confession declares that:—

“Baptism is ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins,” &c.

This is the definition of the one baptism which is applied alike to adults and infants. If it is a sign of the regeneration of

infants, then it is the sign of a real thing. The regeneration then is real. It did not come before baptism, for the children of believers are born in sin. Then it must come along with baptism.

Similar strong language could be quoted from several of those confessions of the Continental churches, in which the Reformation is represented by our author to have been so much more *spiritual* than in the English church. One quotation will suffice. In the Confession of Sueveland we read:—

“As touching baptism, we confess that *which* the Scripture doth in divers places teach thereof; that we by it are buried into the death of Christ (Romans vi. 3, 4), are made one body (1 Cor. xii. 13), and do put on Christ (Gal. iii. 27), that it is the font of regeneration (Titus iii. 5), that it washeth away sins and saveth us (Acts xxii. 16).” (Harmony of Protestant Confessions, P. Hall, p. 315.)

Here, then, in Protestant Churches where the sponsorial system is rejected, where infants are not assumed to profess present penitence and faith, they are yet declared to be regenerate in baptism. If there be Romanizing germs in our Prayer-Book, because it declares baptized infants regenerate, then *à fortiori* there are such germs in the confessions of the spiritually Reformed Churches of the Continent, and in their legitimate children, the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and England. We commend their case to the author of the Germs. And in reply to the solemn question at the close of the book, “Men and brethren, what shall we do?” if we should presume to give an answer, it would be—“By no means go over to the Churches in which these germs are so apparent!”

Into the charges that the Prayer-Book favors the *opus operatum*, and the old Pagan idea of *traselementation*, we do not feel called upon to enter. Indeed, it is difficult to repress a feeling of indignation, which we do not wish to indulge, at these injurious imputations. We think that the force of the author’s remarks upon the subject, if they might be supposed by any persons to have force, will be very much broken by the gross inconsistency of the statement which precedes them, with the author’s position, assumed in an earlier part of the pamphlet. It will be remembered that the author stated (p. 11) that the Liturgy published early in Elizabeth’s reign was Romish, whereas the Articles published in 1571, when coldness had sprung up between Elizabeth and the Pope (as if they had been before very friendly and intimate), were Protestant. But now he states that a protest against this

Romish idea of *opus operatum* was inserted in the Article of Baptism in 1553, when the Liturgy itself was Romish; but that it was withdrawn in 1571, precisely in the year when the Articles were published, "which were hence Protestant." And "in this respect," says the author, "we have ceased to be Protestant." A precious medley of self-confuting statements is this! A highly Protestant protest against the *opus operatum* is inserted in the *Romish* Liturgy of 1553, and withdrawn when the highly *Protestant* Articles of 1571 were adopted; and on this subject we have ceased to be Protestant! An argument thus introduced is not likely to be worth the trouble of confuting!

VII.

THE LORD'S SUPPER AND THE CATECHISM.

The feeblest portions of the whole pamphlet are those which refer to the Lord's Supper and to the Catechism. They are full of trifling and puerile objections. In reference to the first, the author admits that "in times of steadfast adherence to the truth, he should not be disposed to object to our present service." He thus admits substantially that there is nothing in the present service that, in itself, calls for animadversion; and yet he contends that because of the present state of things, this innocuous service *now* has "seeds which in certain circumstances will germinate into Romish error." No greater confusion of ideas than this is possible. The author confounds the perversion of innocent things with the development of injurious things; and makes the former identical with the latter. He makes the innocent things responsible for consequences illogically deduced from them. As he admits that *in itself* there is nothing seriously to object to in our present service, we need not listen to objections which, therefore, cannot be serious. The Catechism, being constructed upon the same principle as the Baptismal service, and that for the administration of the Lord's Supper, is subjected to the same sort of criticism, and does not need a formal vindication.

VIII.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

It will be seen from the foregoing observations that our one object has been to vindicate the Prayer-Book from the very serious charge that it contains many living germs of Romish error. But such a vindication by no means implies that the present writer regards the Liturgy as free from defects. Nor does it imply that in his judgment it might not be expedient, if it were practicable, to introduce some changes for the purpose of relieving the oppressed consciences of some of the ministers and members of the church. It would be a matter of little interest to the readers of this reply to know in detail what might be the opinion or wish of a single individual upon this subject. He contents himself, therefore, with stating that he most emphatically denies the charge that there are any *living germs* of Romanism in the Prayer-Book; and that the utmost admission that he would be willing to make as to this noble and venerable formulary, which he loves and venerates as much as anything which ever came from the hand of man, is that there may possibly be found in it certain minute dead fragments and dried husks of the older system. But these no more injure it than would a few imperceptible hairs which should be caught and incorporated in a strong and glorious silken tissue; and there is no more need to eradicate them than there would be to exterminate a few old fragments of rotting roots from a well ploughed and harrowed wheat field.

Moreover, if such germs are found in it by one who, on the whole, regards it, as our author professes to do, as a noble and pure formulary of faith and worship, who entertains for it that "intelligent affection which will see and confess its faults," then the Prayer-Book, as a whole, will be treated with respect, and no attempt will be made unduly to magnify and multiply its supposed errors. But we are painfully struck in this production with the tone of hostility to the Prayer-Book. It is treated as if from the stand-point of an enemy. An eager search is made for every thing, however minute, which will seem to imply or be consistent with Romanizing doctrine. Petty, quibbling objections are made to incidental expressions. And we do not hesitate to say that while most of the old Puritan objections of the days of Elizabeth and of the Second Charles are repeated, there is *less* admission

of its positive excellencies and pure Protestant character, than was wont to accompany the attacks of those earnest and godly men. As the author proceeds in the investigation his polemic heat increases; and he seems to make the Prayer-Book logically responsible for all the Romanizing and Ritualizing absurdities of the day, and to rejoice in the exposure of its alleged manifold imperfections. As we read these eager criminations, we are reminded of the eloquent words of Burke in reference to those who, in a kindred spirit, magnify and expose the defects of their national institutions.

“No man,” he writes, “should approach to look into the defects or corruptions of the State, but with due caution; he should never dream of beginning its reformation by its subversion; he should approach its faults, as to the wounds of a father, with pious awe and trembling solicitude. He should look with horror on those children of their country, who are prompt rashly to hack that aged parent in pieces, and put him in the kettle of magicians, in hopes that by their poisonous weeds and wild incantations they may regenerate the paternal constitution and renovate their father’s life.”

It is in a spirit similar to this that some children of the church in our day would expose the wounds, as they are supposed to be, of their venerable mother.

We are not sure that it would be too much to say of our author that, adopting the expression of Burke, he seeks the reformation of the Prayer-Book by its subversion. It would be curious to follow the author step by step through the Prayer-Book, and observe how much *would be left*, that is distinctive of the Protestant Episcopal Church, after all that he objects to should have been removed. For it is a peculiarity of the pamphlet that it is wholly employed in *taking away*, and gives no substitutes for what it removes. It makes the inference fair, if not necessary in most cases, that it would have those things to which it objects, removed. The Apocrypha is read only for example of life, and not to establish doctrine—but even this position assigned to it by the Church is liable to lead to an interference with the sole rule of faith. The just inference is—take it away! The homilies are liable to the same misapprehension—take them away! When the preface to the Ordinal says that ancient authors concur with Holy Scripture to confirm the first institution and the continued preservation of Episcopacy, the author concludes that this makes even its divine origin to depend upon *their* authority—hence away with the Fathers as witnesses to Apostolic customs and institutions! Objection is made that certain functions are assigned to the priest which are not permitted to the deacon. Let, then,

the difference between priests and deacons be abolished! This is the character of the pamphlet throughout. Such are the logical deductions that may be made; that must indeed be made from these premises, unless they are expressly disowned. It is all demolition.

Surely this is a new and strange style of speech concerning the Prayer-Book to be heard from churchmen! It is true that occasionally in the past some members of our church have wished that two or three things, or a few things might be changed, or that alternates might be provided for them. This they have wished usually upon the ground that they were liable to be misunderstood or perverted. But that there are in the Prayer-Book *many actual errors*—living germs of Romanism—germs which spring up and bear Romanism as their fruit—this monstrous charge was wont to be made by Puritans, in days past, but is not often made in our day by their descendants. It was reserved for a churchman to bring charges against the Prayer-Book which the other Churches have long forborne to make. And this attack is singularly ill-timed. At a period when the other Churches appreciate, and value, and praise our Liturgy, as it stands prescribed in the Prayer-Book, as they have never done before—when many of them are saying that if only a few things, two or three, were changed, they would rejoice to be able to use it in public worship, members of our own church turn to them and say—“Nay! but it is full of Romanizing germs!” At a period when the Ritualistic and Romanizing party in the Church are contending that a sacerdotal system and baptismal regeneration, and an exclusive Episcopacy, and the *opus operatum* of the sacraments, are to be found in the Prayer-Book, these members of our own Church turn to *them* and say: “You are in the right; they are there!” And the fact that our American Prayer-Book *has actually changed* many things which have been the subjects of animadversion is not made to appear; but on the contrary, the objections to our own Prayer-Book and to the English book are so mingled, that it would be supposed by a casual reader that the two were identical. For instance, that which is called “the absolution” in the English book is in ours called “the declaration of absolution;” the form of absolution in the Visitation of the sick (“I absolve thee,” &c.) is omitted; the words “*verily* taken and received” in the Catechism, in reference to the Lord’s Supper, are changed to “*spiritually* taken and received;” and the alternate in the Ordination of Priests, to which we have referred (page 20), and which is not

mentioned by the author, was introduced. All these modifications of the English Liturgy are ignored, and all in both which can be made to seem to have an unprotestant sense is brought forth to prove that our "*Prayer-Book is the fountain whence flows the stream of Romanizing influence over the church!*"

But the question may be asked: "If these are not Romanizing germs, or if such germs are not in the Prayer-Book, how comes it that so many who use it become Romanizers and Romanists? The fact that the fruit is produced, proves that the seed must have existed. They who exhibit the fruit declare that they found the seed in the Prayer-Book."

Let us apply the same argument in other directions. In the Church of England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there was developed a very pronounced doctrine of Presbyterianism—of ministerial parity—therefore the germs of it must have been in the Prayer-Book; for its advocates urged in its behalf many things in the book itself. There also sprung up in it the doctrine of Independency—therefore its germs must be in the Prayer-Book. At the close of the last and the beginning of the present century, Socinianism appeared extensively in the Church of England. The germs of it must have been in the Prayer-Book! Methodism also originated in the Church of England. The germs of Methodism must have been there! Nay, the argument may be still further extended. All these sects and opinions refer to the Bible for their support. Hence the seeds of them must be in the Bible. The argument is worthless.

But it may be further urged that, as of all the Protestant churches, it is only the Episcopal Church in which these Romanizing tendencies appear, and from which ministers and members go into the Church of Rome, there *must* therefore be something in the Prayer-Book which impels them in that direction.

In the first place it is denied that it is in the Episcopal Church alone that converts to Romanism are made, and that Ritualism is developed. There is a new and powerful development of Ritualism in the Lutheran Church. The writer has known of several instances in which persons have passed from Protestant orthodox Churches into the Church of Rome. He is acquainted with two persons who have recently passed out of Spiritualism directly into the Church of Rome. The causes of these conversions are not to be found in any Romanizing germs in the articles of faith of these orthodox systems, nor in the wild creed of the Spiritualists. The germs of Romanism are found in the human heart.

Let our readers turn to the profound work of Archbishop Whately, entitled, "*The Errors of Romanism Traced to their Source in Human Nature*"—a title concerning which Daniel Webster once remarked to the writer that it condensed a whole volume of philosophic thought—and he will there see where the Romanizing germs are to be found, from which sprang the Church of Rome itself out of the midst of one of the purest of the primitive Churches in doctrine and in life, and from which ever since that Church has been sustained, and from which the sacerdotal system has intruded, more or less, into Churches of many names. And, moreover, it is well known that the larger part of those who Romanize most in the Church, or go over to the Church of Rome, have entered the Episcopal Church from other denominations. It is charged that as they could not have received any Romanizing influence in their respective Churches, they *must* have received them in the Episcopal Church. But he must have been a very careless observer, or had but small experience, who is not persuaded that many of them brought these Romanizing germs with them, as they entered the Church. Who has not known men who have entered the Church avowedly on their own long-felt and independently derived conviction of the truth and necessity of an exclusive Episcopacy, and of sacramental grace, of whom he has been able to predict that they would at once become Romanizers and Ritualists of the most advanced type? It is denied, therefore, that it is exclusively in the Episcopal Church that Romanizing germs are sown in the hearts of men.

And yet, admitting the fact that it is in our Church chiefly that a Romanizing tendency is developed, it would not be difficult to show that there are causes quite apart from the existence of Romanizing germs in the Prayer-Book to account for the fact. The point is one of great interest, and is worthy of a full treatment. We can devote to it but a few sentences.

Every fundamental religious error is the result of a perversion, or of a too exclusive attention to some one portion of Scriptural truth. The thought is too familiar to need amplification or illustration. Now, in Churches or Confessions in which certain truths are ignored or omitted or slightly mentioned, there will ordinarily be but little tendency to error in the direction of a perversion of those omitted or neglected truths. Hence in the Congregational bodies there is little danger of excess in the Churchly and Ritualistic directions! And, on the other hand, where great prominence is given to certain truths, there will be a

danger of a perversion of *them* into grievous error. For instance, in those same bodies the right and duty of private judgment have been so emphatically set forth, that it has often led to the most exaggerated individualism and self-reliance. Now, in our Church greater prominence has been given than in other Protestant bodies, to the doctrines of the Church, the Ministry, and the Sacraments. We contend, of course, that we give no more prominence to these doctrines than are assigned to them in the word of God. We have moreover a Ritual which is historical, and which, while it contains some features which are common to it and the Church of Rome, is purged, as we believe, and as churchmen with great unanimity have hitherto believed, of all Romish errors, and which utters against those errors emphatic protests. Now, as in other Protestant bodies, the *perversions* of the truths which they embody may naturally be in an unchurchly and Socinian direction, not because the *germs* of them are in their confessions (that, we are quite unwilling to believe), but because, perhaps, the counter-truths which might prevent their development are not there; so, just as naturally, in our church the *perversion* of the truths which we have made prominent, is often in the direction of ministerial exclusiveness, of sacramental *opus operatum* grace, of exaggerated Ritualism, and of a near approach, or an actual conversion to the Church of Rome. Nor has this development arisen from the absence of the most full and emphatic exposition of the doctrines of grace—of the great spiritual verities of the Gospel—although we fear it may be traced in many cases to the failure of those who minister in the Church to present them with the same fulness, and in the same relations to the doctrine of the Church and Ministry and Sacraments, with which they are exhibited in the book of Common-Prayer.

In conclusion, we cannot but remark upon the singularity of the fact, that the author of this pamphlet and those who share his views, should so recently have awakened to the conviction that there are errors, or germs of error, in the Prayer-Book so serious as to be an offence to their consciences. Conscientious convictions are always to be respected, even when we regard them as proceeding from mistaken views. And if earnest and conscientious men, as we well know these our brethren to be, are convinced that they cannot perform our services without contradicting the saving truths of God and inculcating deadly error, then however much we may regret, as they must regret, the solemn alternative of leaving the church, we see not well how it

can be avoided. We earnestly wish—but we scarcely hope—that such relief may be extended to them, in the way of alternate forms at least, as may prevent this lamentable result. The writer of these lines has no difficulty in accepting the whole Prayer-Book as it is; but he would rejoice to see it made still more comprehensive. He hopes that there are not many persons more distressed than he is at the recent Ritualistic and Romanizing developments in the Church. He feels assured that there is no one who has a stronger conviction that they have no sanction in our book of Common-Prayer. But he would earnestly and affectionately suggest to his brethren, who feel “a stress of conscience which will not allow them to rest content in their present status,” whether the following considerations do not form a powerful dissuasive from their half-expressed purpose of separation from the church.

We suppose that *they* did not consciously subscribe to anything Romanizing, when they promised to adhere to the doctrine, worship, and discipline of the Church. They then believed that our formularies were thoroughly Protestant. It was not to any Romish or Romanizing *interpretation* of these formularies, such as they themselves now give, that they were required to subscribe. Nor is it now required or enjoined upon them by any authority, that they should hold and proclaim in their own teaching what they think they find, in germ, in the Prayer-Book. Nor is their liberty to denounce these supposed germs taken away. Nor are they hindered from proclaiming the truth according to their own convictions, and of working and regulating their parishes in accordance with their own views of what the Prayer-Book teaches, and ought to teach, on the subject of the Church, the Ministry, and Sacraments. Only one law of the church—and that not the law, as they believe, but a misinterpretation of the law—forbids them to sustain such a relation to the ministers of other churches as they desire. Now, when our brethren have cleared their consciences by exposing and protesting against these errors, and when they are not required to teach them, but are at liberty most emphatically to teach the opposite of them, the question must occur, “*Ought* there to be, under these circumstances, a strong pressure upon an enlightened conscience? *Can* one, in fact, proclaim deadly error by the use of certain services, when *not* that dogma which is regarded as an error, but another, which is regarded as a blessed truth, is understood by the people to be proclaimed, and for three hundred years by a vast majority of

ministers and members of the church has been constantly so regarded?" These are questions for our brethren solemnly and prayerfully to consider and decide. May the spirit of truth lead them to such a decision as will redound to the glory of God!

But separation—alas! what good has ever come in the Protestant church from separation? On this point, we commend to our brethren the wise and weighty words of a recent editorial from that admirable journal "The Christian Witness and Church Advocate," of Boston:—

"The Puritans left us, and they formed a priesthood to which for inquisitorial energy and sacerdotal despotism the ministry they discarded was the merest shadow. The Methodists left us, and they established an Episcopate whose little finger is heavier than the entire Episcopate loins they once held so oppressive. There is no Ecclesiastical system that can be framed that does not contain an energy of Ecclesiasticism which becomes more or less effective as the tide sways to or fro; and the narrower the sect is, as in the case of the Covenanters, the intenser this Ecclesiasticism is."